

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action dated February 2, 2005. Claims 1-33 were canceled. New claims 34-55 are submitted. Claims 34-55 are pending.

In the Office Action of February 2, 2005 the Examiner rejected claims 1-33. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15, 16, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Brokenshire (U.S. Publication 2002/0158885). Claims 25-27, 29, and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Brokenshire. Claims 6, 4, 17-24, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Brokenshire in view of Gosset (U.S. Pat. No. 6,606,093).

Applicant requests that claims 1-33 be cancelled without prejudice or waiver of the right to pursue the claims in one or more continuation applications.

New claims 34-55 were submitted to claim inventions in which gamma correction of partially covered primitives is selectively enabled. The new claims are supported in the original claims, such as original claims 3, 9, 10, 22, 29 and elsewhere in Applicant's specification, such as on page 7, paragraphs [0038] –[0039].

Independent claims 34, 41, and 47 describe an invention in which the gamma correction of coverage values is enabled for a selected class of primitives, where the class includes at least one member from a group consisting of at least two different types of primitives. In conventional graphics systems, two or more different types of primitives are typically supported, such as lines, stippled lines, circles (e.g., points), and polygons. Independent claim 45 describes an invention in which gamma correction of coverage values is performed in response to determining that the scene is enabled for gamma correction of partially covered pixels.

Applicant's claimed inventions provide the benefit of improved control over gamma correction. The degree to which visual artifacts generated by aliasing are disturbing to a user depends upon many factors including user preferences, the type of primitive, lighting conditions, and the nature of the scene. As described in Applicant's specification in paragraphs [0006]-[0007], aliasing generates visual artifacts, such as "roping" that depend on many factors. For example, roping is a particular problem for narrow lines that have an arbitrary angle. However, roping may not be as severe a problem for certain types of images, such as static icons having fixed angles. Moreover, roping is particularly noticeable for a sequence of scenes in which

primitives moves across a display. This is because primitives that move across a display can have abrupt changes in pixel coverage at the edges of primitives, particularly if the angular orientation of the primitive rotates from scene to scene.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 34-55 include a number of limitations related to selectively enabling gamma correction that are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

Independent claims 34, 41, and 47 include a limitation similar to claim 34 of: "enabling gamma correction of a selected class of primitive types, said selected class including at least one member selected from a group of at least two different primitive types. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest this limitation. The detailed examples in Brokenshire and Gossett describe only gamma correction of lines. More particularly, there is no teaching or suggestion in Brokenshire and Gossett of selecting the types of primitives that will be gamma corrected from a group of different primitive types.

Independent claim 45 includes a limitation that "in response to determining that gamma correction of partially covered pixels is enabled for said scene, gamma correcting coverage values of at least one type of primitive to form gamma corrected coverage values." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest this limitation. In particular, Brokenshire and Gossett do not teach or suggest selectively enabling gamma correction of partially covered pixels on a per-scene basis.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons and also include additional limitations. In light of the remarks above, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if there are any residual issues that can be resolved through a telephone call.


Attorney Docket No. NVID-073/00US  
Client Ref. P000680  
Serial No. 10/671,237  
Page 9

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees to Deposit  
Account No. 03-3117.

Dated: June 2, 2005

COOLEY GODWARD LLP  
ATTN: Patent Group  
Five Palo Alto Square  
3000 El Camino Real  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155  
Tel: (650) 843-5000  
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,  
COOLEY GODWARD LLP



By:

---

Edward Van Gieson  
Reg. No. 44,386